

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9-15 and 18, 21 and 23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 23 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, and 23 are hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification, specifically at Figures 7, 8, and 9 and on pages 9, 10, and 11. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

### **II. SUPPORT FOR THIS AMENDMENT**

Citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided. However, such citations are provided merely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

As an example, support of the amendment can be found at Figures 7, 8, and 9 and pages 9, 10, and 11 of the Specification.

### III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 6, 9-13 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein, et al (hereinafter, merely “Schein”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,469,354 to Hatakeyama, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hatakeyama”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,488,725 to Turtle, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Turtle”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,165,098 to Boyer, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Boyer”).

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein, Hatakeyama, Turtle, and Boyer, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,547 to Huxley, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Huxley”).

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Hatakeyama, Turtle, and Boyer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livowsky et al.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Hatakeyama, Turtle, and Boyer and further in view of U.S. Pre Grant Publication No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al.

Claims 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over unpatentable over Schein in view of Hatakeyama, Turtle and Boyer and further in view of Livowsky.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Hatakeyama, Turtle and Boyer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428 to Lee et al.

#### IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Applicants respectfully submit that Schein, Hatakeyama, Turtle, and Boyer, taken alone or in combination, fail to suggest or render predictable 1) pre-designating a particular database from among a plurality of databases, including an electronic-program-guide database, a movie information database, and a drama information database; 2) selecting a route to the particular database that is pre-selected as a function of stored access information and stored path information; and 3) searching electronic-program-guide data from the particular database that is pre-selected as a function of the input retrieval keyword and the at least one extracted additional keyword., as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...pre-designating a particular database from among a plurality of databases, including an electronic-program-guide database, a movie information database, and a drama information database;  
selecting a route to the particular database that is pre-selected as a function of stored access information and stored path information;  
and  
searching electronic-program-guide data from the particular database that is pre-selected as a function of the input retrieval keyword and the at least one extracted additional keyword.”  
(Emphasis Added)

Generally, claim 1 relates to a system where a user can enter a keyword. Other search terms relevant to the keyword are then extracted from a database. A particular database is pre-designated from among a plurality of databases and a route is selected as a function of stored

access information and stored path information. Using the original keyword and the relevant other terms, the particular database that is pre-designated is searched.

As understood by Applicants, Schein relates to a method and apparatus for searching a guide and using a user's input of desired program characteristics to identify particular programs that may be of interest to the user.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Schein, Hatakeyama, Turtle, or Boyer that would teach the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 11 and 23 are patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11 and 23 are patentable.

## V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on

each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800